

## REMARKS

Applicants note with appreciation that, in the Office Action of January 11, 2008, claims 17 and 19 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claims 1-16, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,495 (hereinafter “Sevalia et al.”). In addition, the specification was objected to because the disclosure does not contain the recommended sections and arrangement of the sections per 37 CFR 1.77(b). Furthermore, claims 1-20 were objected to because “*the global address space*” in claims 1 and 20 allegedly lacks proper antecedent basis.

With respect to the objection to the specification, Applicants respectfully decline to add the section headings because the suggestions provided in 37 C.F.R. §1.77(b) are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 USC § 111(a), but per 37 C.F.R. § 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for Applicants’ use. The section headings are not mandatory, and in fact when Rule 77 was amended in 1996 (61 FR 42790, Aug. 19, 1996), Bruce A. Lehman, Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, stated in the Official Gazette:

“Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... 1.77 merely expresses the Office's preference for the arrangement of the application elements. The Office may advise an applicant that the application does not comply with the format set forth in 1.77, and suggest this format for the applicant's consideration; however, the Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77.”

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully decline to amend the specification to include the suggested section headings and request that this specification objection be withdrawn.

With respect to the objections to claims 1-20 regarding lack of antecedent basis, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 20 by replacing “*the*

*global address space*” with “*a global address space*.” As such, Applicants respectfully request that these objections be withdrawn.

With respect to the “objected to” claim 17, Applicants have rewritten claim 17 in independent form by amending claim 16. Thus, claim 17 has been canceled. In view of this claim amendment, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 16 be allowed.

With respect to the Section 102 rejections of claim 1-16, 18 and 20, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1 and 20 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited references of Sevalia et al. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 20 have also been amended to remove reference letters in parentheses. As amended, the independent claims 1 and 20 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Sevalia et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of pending claims 1-16 and 18-20.

#### A. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*said control means being external to said memory and being configured to generate memory addresses for writing to and reading from said memory*,” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Sevalia et al. Consequently, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Sevalia et al.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The cited reference of Sevalia et al. in column 2, lines 39-45, discloses a circuit 100, which may be constructed from one large block of memory that may be configured into several sub-blocks, e.g., FIFO storage queues 102a-102n. The cited reference of Sevalia et al. in column 2, lines 45-51, further states that “[t]he FIFO storage queues 102a-102n may each comprise (i) a flag logic circuit, (ii) read logic circuits and (iii) write logic circuits (not shown).” Thus, the read and logic circuits are part of the memory 100. Therefore, the cited reference of Sevalia et al. does not disclose the limitation of “*said control means being external to said memory*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Furthermore, the cited reference of Sevalia et al. does not disclose a control means that is “*configured to generate memory addresses for writing to and reading from said memory*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Sevalia et al., and respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claim 20, which recites similar limitations as those of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claim 20 is also not anticipated by the cited reference of Sevalia et al., and respectfully request that the amended independent claim 20 be allowed as well.

#### B. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-15, 18 and 19

Each of the dependent claims 2-15, 18 and 19 depends on the amended independent claim 1. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the amended independent claim 1.

As an example, the dependent claim 3 recites “*wherein said address ranges comprise overlapping regions of a predetermined size*,” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Sevalia et al. The Office Action on page 7 states that “Sevalia teaches wherein the address ranges comprise overlapping regions of a predetermined size as being able to assign different FIFOs which can provide overlapping regions

when the same FIFOs or sub-blocks are used for the ranges (e.g., see col. 2, lines 18-60).” Applicants fail to see the claimed limitation of claim 3 disclosed in the cited passage of Sevalia et al., as alleged in the Office Action, since there is no mention of overlapping regions. Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed limitation of claim 3 is not disclosed in the cited reference of Sevalia et al., and respectfully request that the dependent claim 3 be allowed.

As another example, the dependent claim 7 recites “*a buffer memory connectable to said at least one access port and to said memory, wherein a line width of said buffer memory and said memory is selected to be greater or equal the data width of said at least one access port multiplied by the sum of read accesses and write accesses per cycle,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Sevalia et al. The Office Action on page 8 states that “Sevalia teaches further comprising a buffer memory connectable to at least one access port and to the memory, wherein a line width of the buffer memory and the memory is selected to be greater or equal the data width of at least one access port multiplied by the sum of read accesses and write accesses per cycle (e.g., see col. 2, lines 7-60).” Applicants again fail to see the claimed limitation of claim 7 disclosed in the cited passage of Sevalia et al., as alleged in the Office Action, since there is no mention of a buffer memory connectable to the memory or the line width of the buffer memory. Applicants respectfully assert that the claimed limitation of claim 7 is not disclosed in the cited reference of Sevalia et al., and respectfully request that the dependent claim 7 be allowed.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
Sawitzki et al.

Date: January 11, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/  
Thomas H. Ham  
Registration No. 43,654  
Telephone: (925) 249-1300